

REMARKS

In accordance with the above amendments, claims 10, 18 and 24 have been amended and claims 10-24 remain under consideration in this application. No claim has been allowed.

Comments Regarding Applicant's Invention:

With regard to applicant's invention, certain additional explanatory remarks are believed to be in order. With regard to the embodiments encompassed by amended claims 10-17, the system for reducing potential for substance abuse in skin-worn patch devices requires a separate disposable container which clearly is not part of the skin-worn patch device itself. A layer in the container includes the anti-abuse substance which is effective when a patch is inserted into the container in the proper orientation such that the abusable substance and the anti-abuse substance come into contact. The container into which the skin-worn patch device is inserted clearly forms no part of the patch device itself, and the anti-abuse substance is clearly not found in the skin-worn patch itself.

The embodiments encompassed by claims 18-24 include a skin-worn transdermal patch having a dual-layer system in which an anti-abuse layer and the abusable or therapeutic substance layer are separated by an impermeable membrane which remains in place until the patch is removed from the skin of a user, at which time the separator membrane is removed only by the action to remove

the connector device. This happens automatically. This technique is decidedly directed to a used patch upon removal.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 10, 11, 15-19, 23 and 24 have been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sackler (US Publication 2003/0068392 A1) in view of Stanley et al (USPN 6,261,595 B1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Sackler '392 does disclose transdermal delivery systems in which an abusable subject, such as opioid, is combined with an antagonist for the opioid in a transdermal delivery system. In one embodiment, the opioid agonist and an adverse agent can be separated by a layer which becomes disrupted when the dosage form is tampered with, thereby mixing the aversive agent with the opioid agonist. Sackler '392, however, fails to teach or suggest any of the claimed anti-abuse systems of the present invention. Thus, Sackler fails to teach a separate disposal system containing the anti-abuse substance separate from the skin-worn patch, and Sackler fails to teach the impermeable separation membrane which is automatically removed upon removal of the patch from a user thereby preventing tampering with a used patch.

Stanley et al. '595 discloses a patch with a heating element pouch as an integral part of the patch. That pouch is substantially filled by a heating element for use with that patch device. The pouch of Stanley is not a separate and distinct

entity from the patch device nor does it contain any anti-abuse substance.

Thus, it is clear that the independent claims of the present invention distinguish over any combination of Sackler and Stanley et al. Since all other claims add additional limitations, they also distinguish. The combination neither teaches nor suggests inventions covered by any of the present claims. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 10, 11, 15-19, 23 and 24 have also been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sackler '392 or Gale et al. (USPN 4,588,580) in view of Stanley et al. '596 and Lee et al. (USPN 5,236,714). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Sackler '392 and Stanley '596 have clearly already been distinguished. Gale et al. '580 describes a transdermal delivery system for delivery of fentanyl and its derivatives which shows, in one embodiment, a patch with an integral pouch. This reference is believed irrelevant to the use of a separate container for disposing of a skin-worn patch, which container contains the anti-abuse substance, as Gale discloses neither a separate container nor an anti-abuse substance and whether or not the rate controlling membrane 3 could serve as a closure means is of no consequence to the present invention.

Lee et al. '714 discloses a dosage form in which an abusable

substance is mixed with an antagonist in the same reservoir. The anti-abuse systems and techniques there are not seen to be relevant to any of the techniques or embodiments of the presently claimed invention.

It is believed that no combination of the patents of this rejection would result in anything that either teaches or suggests the present claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner's comments regarding the obviousness of one skilled in the art providing the separate pouch to dispose of the drug delivery system of Sackler or Gale or Lee has no basis in the prior art. Not only do the present claims require or are directed to those embodiments require a separate pouch, the pouch must contain the anti-abuse substance and the disposed patch must be placed and contained in a proper orientation. None of this is suggested or taught by any of the prior art cited. Clearly, no motivation exists for such a device as, for example, the patch as disclosed by Sackler and Lee contain their own antagonist within the patch.

Finally, claims 12-14 and 20-23 have been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sackler '392 or Gale '580 or Lee '714 in view of Schoendorfer et al. (USPN 5,899,856). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Sackler, Gale and Lee have already been more adequately

distinguished from any of the claims in the present application and the addition of any charcoal-containing binding or absorption pad as may be taught in Schoendorfer et al. '856 has no bearing on the clear basic differences between the presently claimed invention and the other three references. Also, if one was to mix an activated carbon with the transdermal patch during formulation as suggested by the Examiner, no drug would be delivered at all as it would then be in a bound state. The Schoendorfer et al. carbon patches are for entirely different purposes. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The other references cited by the Examiner have been carefully considered and the claims are believed to be clearly patentable over any of these.

In view of the above amendments taken together with the remarks herein the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his position, withdraw the rejections and allow all of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

NIKOLAI & MERSEREAU, P.A.




C. G. Mersereau
Registration No. 26205
900 Second Avenue So.
Suite 820
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 339-7461

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

SEP 04 2007

I hereby certify that the foregoing Amendment and Transmittal Letter in application Serial No. 10/763,628, filed on January 23, 2004, of Carter R. Anderson et al, entitled "ABUSE POTENTIAL REDUCTION IN ABUSABLE SUBSTANCE DOSAGE FORM" are being sent by facsimile transmission to: BOX AF, The Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on September 4, 2007.



April C. Nelson
on behalf of C. G. Mersereau
Attorney for Applicant

Date of Signature: September 4, 2007